

**REMARKS**

**I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 47-94 are pending. No claims have been amended by this response.

**II. Objection to Abstract**

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract for referring to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention. Office Action at page 3.

Although Applicants disagree with the objection, to expedite prosecution, the abstract has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection has been rendered moot.

**III. Objection to Claims**

The Examiner has objected to claims 71-94 for allegedly misspelling the term "polyene." Office Action at page 4.

Applicants respectfully disagree with this objection. The term "polyene," as used in the claims, does not refer to or encompass the compound, propylene. "Polyene" is a well-known chemical term, which the specification has expressly defined as "a conjugated or non-conjugated diene, triene or tetraene." See Specification at page 12, lines 22-25.

Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the claims.

#### **IV. Double Patenting Rejection**

The Examiner has rejected claims 47-94 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 1-48 of U.S. Patent No. 6,824,870 to Castellani et al. ("Castellani") for the reasons disclosed on pages 3-4 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be held in abeyance until otherwise allowable subject matter has been identified.

#### **V. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 47-94 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by WO 02/03398 to Castellani et al. ("WO '398") for the reasons set forth on pages 4-12 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner asserts that WO '398 discloses a cable comprising, *inter alia*, a dielectric liquid having "an amount of polar compound lower than or equal to 2.5% by weight with respect to the total weight of the dielectric liquid (Page 9, lines 9-10), a melting point or a pour point lower than 800C' [sic], and a ratio of number of aromatic carbon atoms with respect to the total number of carbon atoms lower than 0.6, when the dielectric liquid is aromatic (Page 4, lines 15-20)." Office Action at page 5. Applicants disagree.

For a reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach each and every element as set forth in the claim. See *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union*

PATENT  
Customer No. 22,852  
Application No. 10/542,572  
Attorney Docket No. 09875.0001-00

*Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987);  
M.P.E.P. § 2131.

WO '398 clearly requires its dielectric liquid to have a ratio of number of aryl carbon atoms to total number of carbon atoms greater than or equal to **0.6 preferably greater than or equal to 0.7**. See WO '398 at page 4, lines 17-20, page 10, lines 6-8, and page 18, lines 12-14. The present claims recite "a ratio of number of aromatic carbon atoms with respect to the total number of carbon atoms **lower than 0.6**, when the dielectric liquid is aromatic." (emphasis added). The ranges of the ratio of the number of aryl atoms to total carbon atoms do not overlap, and therefore cannot anticipate.

Furthermore, WO '398 does not teach or suggest a dielectric liquid having "an amount of polar compound lower than or equal to 2.5% by weight with respect to the total weight of the dielectric liquid [and] a melting point or a pour point lower than 80°C," as recited in the present claims. Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's citation to page 9, line 9-10, because this recitation merely discloses the weight ratio of the dielectric liquid to thermoplastic polymer.

Thus, WO '398 does not teach all of the limitations recited in the present claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

PATENT  
Customer No. 22,852  
Application No. 10/542,572  
Attorney Docket No. 09875.0001-00

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 19, 2006

By: Anthony A. Hartmann  
Anthony A. Hartmann  
Reg. No. 43,662